



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tomed to resort to play is held, in *Nelson v. McLellan* (Wash.), 60 L. R. A. 795, to be negligence which will render the one guilty thereof liable for injuries to a child by the explosion of one of the sticks, which was taken from the box by children who had resorted to the lot to play, and ignited by one of them in ignorance of its explosive character.

PRINCIPAL AND AGENT—DUTY TO DISCLOSE—CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD.—An agent who is authorized by his principal to sell or exchange the property of the latter upon specified prices and terms is held, in *Holmes v. Cutcart* (Minn.), 60 L. R. A. 734, to be in duty bound, upon learning that a more advantageous sale or exchange can be made, the facts concerning which are unknown to the principal, to communicate the same to him before making the sale as expressly authorized, and his failure to do so held to amount to a fraud in law.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE—MISCONDUCT OF COUNSEL.—The conduct of the assistant prosecutor on a trial for rape, in repeatedly asking the son of the accused, on cross-examination, if he had not stated to a specified person that he suspected his father of having committed a similar offense with other girls, and that such conduct on the part of the accused caused the death of the witness's mother, and that if, at such conversation, the witness did not cry out and say: "I cannot go against my father even if he is guilty," is held in *State v. Irwin* (Idaho), 60 L. R. A. 716, to be ground for reversal.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—ADMISSIBILITY OF PRIVATE PAPERS.—On the trial of a criminal case, where private papers and property belonging to the defendant are offered in evidence against him, the court, in determining their admissibility, will not take into account the manner in which a witness obtained possession of them.

The introduction in evidence by the prosecution of private papers and property belonging to the defendant, which had been seized by officers, for the purpose of establishing his handwriting on certain policy slips and to show that he was in possession of them and the place where they were found, is not violative of the constitutional guaranty against compelling a prisoner to be a witness against himself. *People v. Adams* (Ct. App. N. Y.), 30 N. Y. L. J. 555. Citing *Commonwealth v. Tibbetts*, 157 Mass. 519; *Ruloff v. People*, 45 N. Y. 213; *People v. Van Wormer*, 175 N. Y. 188; 1 Greenleaf's Evidence, sec. 245 a. Distinguishing *Boyd v. U. S.*, 116 U. S. 616.

In *People v. O'Brien*, 68 N. E. 353, the same court construed the following section of the New York Penal Code, chapter 9, relating to gaming: "No person shall be excused from giving testimony upon any investigation and proceeding for a violation of this chapter, upon the ground that such testimony would tend to convict him of a crime; but such testimony cannot be received against him upon any criminal investigation or proceeding." It was held that under this statute a witness cannot be compelled to disclose circumstances which would